Committee Management User's Group (CMUG)

Meeting Date: March 23, 2005, Wednesday
Time: 1:00–2:30 p.m.
Location: Rockledge 2, Room 7111
Advocate: Anna Snouffer
Chair: David Clary
Analyst: Sophonia Simms

Next Meeting: April 20, 1–4 p.m., Rockledge 2, Room 7111

CM Web URL: http://apps.era.nih.gov/cm/

Action Items

1. (All) Create a list of events and roles that should be addressed within the eNotifications system and email them to Anna Snouffer.

2. (Anna Snouffer / Sophonia Simms) Consolidate the CMUG group's list of events and roles that should be addressed within eNotifications into one requirements document.

3. (All) Anyone interested in participating in the testing of the J2EE version of CM should email Anna Snouffer.

Documents

1. PowerPoint Presentation on eNotifications

(http://era.nih.gov/docs/eNotification - Presentation.pdf)

2. J2EE Conversion Schedule

(http://era.nih.gov/docs/J2EE Conversion one-pager schedule.pdf)

eNotification Demonstration

Inna Faenson / Daniel Fox

Sophonia Simms began the meeting by introducing Inna Faenson and Daniel Fox, two eRA staffers who helped design the eNotification system. Sophonia stated that their presentation will allow the group to understand how this system would assist Committee Management (CM). Inna informed the group that eNotification will move into pilot on April 1, after which it will be tested by users. She stated that the overall purpose of this system is to notify users, via email and through the eNotification screen, of any and all business events that occur during the run-life cycle. Inna suggested that group members think of the events they would like to be notified about and any details they think eNotifications should include.

Daniel presented a PowerPoint slideshow (http://era.nih.gov/docs/eNotification - Presentation.pdf) that spelled out all the functions of the eNotification system. He described the eRA One View project, where all systems are linked by one homepage. The "My eNotification" queue is stored on this homepage. In addition to this online notification, the

user also has the option of receiving an email from eNotification, sent without modifying the Committee Management software. Since this system is a shared module, every application can access it. It is also a stand-alone module, which means that it has its own login page, making it easy and quick to access. He then showed the group screenshots of the existing eNotifications system, including the login and My eNotifications screens. Daniel noted that the first iteration is very grant-centric, meaning that all of the notifications are grant related. However, in the future, the system will cover a greater range of issues.

Daniel suggested that the group begin brainstorming on what the event queue for meeting types should look like. He also suggested that they define what events they would like to include in this function. The group agreed that every time a meeting is checked as complete, notification should be supplied by the Grants Technical Assistant (GTA) to a Committee Management staff member so that the information can be added to the Federal Register. Daniel said that the key to managing the group's request was finding that specific CM staff member; otherwise, the function becomes problematic and hard to accomplish. The group agreed that the Committee Management Officer (CMO) would be responsible for this action.

Inna stated that another great feature of eNotifications was that the administrator can completely edit the notifications that are sent, allowing for greater flexibility. All notifications are automatic. Committee Management does have a system like this, but it is in the not-often-used web based system for CM. Daniel assured the group that eNotification would be able to accommodate both web based and non-web based systems.

Daniel went over the specific functionality of the email features of the eNotification system. He stated that users could either receive individual emails, where an email is sent for every event, or consolidated emails, where the user is notified of multiple events at the beginning of a given week. The group agreed that they would prefer the individual email option, so that they could more efficiently organize their events. The email option also features support for multiple attachments and delays, whereby the administrator can set a 24-hour notice for released reports.

The rollout for the eNotification, as listed on the PowerPoint presentation, is on the following schedule:

1. *First Release* – Proof of concept and Pilot system (slated for April 1)

2. *Near Future* - Complete coding of My eNotification Screen

3. *Near / Far Future* – Consolidate all eRA systems under eNotifications

> Q. Where is Committee Management within this schedule?

> A. Daniel stated that CMUG is currently under the *Near Future* section.

Inna mentioned a requirements document that Daniel previously created with other groups concerning the eNotification system. This document outlines the different roles involved within the process and describes the layout of the system in general. Sophonia suggested that the CMUG group follow suit. Group members are urged to come up with events and roles and send them via email to Anna Snouffer, who will forward them to Sophonia to be consolidated in their own document. At the next meeting, the group will be able to more clearly define its requirements.

> **Action: (Group) Create a list of events and roles that should be addressed within the eNotifications system and email them to Anna Snouffer.**

Action: (Anna Snouffer / Sophonia Simms) Consolidate the CMUG group's list of events and roles that should be addressed within eNotifications into one requirements document.

Daniel and Inna explained that the eNotifications function will help streamline and assist in a better organization of Committee Management.

CM Conversion Status / Testing Schedule

Sophonia Simms

Sophonia presented the group with a handout (http://era.nih.gov/docs/J2EE Conversion one-pager schedule.pdf) illustrating the basic conversion schedule for the J2EE migration. This schedule shows when the code will be delivered and when the different stages of testing will begin and take place. The target date for Committee Management is the first phase, Phase 2.1. The initial code will be delivered on April 6, the first phase of testing is targeted for April 25. Acceptance testing is on the 23 of May, and the target Production Pilot date is on June 6. As far as the testing method, testers will go to Rockledge 1 and document any found defects. Sophonia said that though it is preferred that the testers be present during testing, it is not mandatory. She said that they can work around any scheduling issues that may arise.

Currently, there are about 14 testers, and they are looking for a total of 20. Anna stated that they are particularly looking for Scientific Review and Evaluation Award (SREA) representatives to assist in these tests. Any group members interested in signing up for testing are instructed to send an email to Anna, who will then send the new list of testers to Sophonia for consolidation. Any questions should be directed to Sophonia.

> Q. Does all the testing take place on one day?

> A. No, April 25 is just the start date. Testing will continue past that date.

Action: (All) Anyone interested in participating in the J2EE version of CM should email Anna Snouffer.

Table Talk

IMPAC II Nominations—The subject of IMPAC II Nominations was brought up to the group. Kay Valeda has a non-NIH nomination package where 12 people are included on the nomination package this year. The group wanted to know what will happen with the Nomination process for non-NIH committees, and whether it will go through this year without much problem. Anna identified two main problems with the Nomination process:

1. The text portion of the 532 form is hard-coded, and automatically prints the acronym by default.

2. There are funding issues that are still being investigated.

There may be a backend solution that is connected to an Operating Divisions (OPDIV) function. This is currently being looked into and will be discussed at a later period.

PERM Profile / Role MLG Update— Everett Sinnett inquired as to whether or not there was any further discussion about the PERM Profile and Role MLG (mailing address) topic brought up at the last meeting (http://era.nih.gov/docs/CMUG 01_26_05 FINAL REPORT.pdf). Sophonia stated that this issue was still being discussed. Ev went over what was discussed at the last meeting, but wondered what would happen in the situation where someone is selected on a previous role. He also noticed that there was an issue concerning standing members' residence addresses (where the checks are mailed). They are supposed to have control of their residence addresses in the Commons, but it is not currently being copied into the meeting information. Group members said that some standing members do not choose to have paychecks sent to their residence addresses. They said that these issues would soon be moot, since the SREA transition will alter this process. As long as a user's bank account information is correct, everything should be alright after the conversion. There is apparently also an issue where addresses are not coming in completely when they are sent. This is most likely a result of user error, users not entering in the date information in the incorrect fields. David Clary stated that they will talk more about residence address issues further at the next meeting.

Combining Similar Profiles— A member brought up the issue of the dangers inherent in combining the profiles of people with the same name within the email system. All the information, including birth date and social security number, are in danger of collapse when they are combined with another person's. This is an issue of which the group needs to be aware.

Attendees

Clary, David	Colston, CarmenMartin	David, Tracey
Faenson, Inna	Fox, Daniel	Grabner, Caroline
Kemmerle, Donna	Nuss, Mary	Paugh, Steve
Reid, Cikena	Sanders, Dorothy	Simms, Sophonia
Sinnett, Everett	Southworth, Linda	Snouffer, Anna
Valeda, Kay	Vilensky, Zenia	Whelan, Kate